

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-34 are pending, and the Examiner rejected all claims. By this Amendment, claims 4, 6, 12, and 25 have been amended. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-34 remain pending in the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below, and reconsideration of all rejected claims is respectfully requested.

Objection To the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to the specification because of a typographical error located in line 2 of paragraph [0005], in which a space was erroneously omitted. The Examiner pointed out that the words "base 101that corresponds" should read as "base 101 that corresponds".

By this Amendment, the specification has been amended to correct the typographical error. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to the specification.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action the Examiner objected to claims 4, 12, and 25 for various grammatical informalities and/or typographical errors.

By this Amendment, claims 4, 12, and 25 have been amended to correct these informalities and/or typographical errors. Additionally, claim 6 has been amended to correct a typographical error. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections to these claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §102

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-18, 22-28, 30-31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Description of the Related Art in the specification, which the Examiner has characterized as the "Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA)," as identified by Figures 1-2B of the drawings, and pages 1-2 of the specification. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

Claim 1 of the present application recites a "monitor apparatus including a monitor, and a base to support the monitor," having "a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor." The Applicants respectfully submit that the Description of the Related Art in the specification, which is illustrated in Figures 1-2B, does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of claim 1.

The Examiner states that the Description of the Related Art discloses "a connecting bracket (fig. 1) rotatably combined to the monitor (102), the connecting bracket having first and second upper supporters (fig. 1) to rotatably support upper parts of the first and second links, respectively." However, the Applicants respectfully submit that it is quite clear that upper part of the connecting member 110, which is incorporated with the monitor 102, does not disclose a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor 102. In fact, the upper part of the connecting member 110 is shown in Figures 2A and 2B to be fixed relative to the monitor 102. As clearly illustrated in Figure 2B, because of the monitor 102 being fixed relative to the upper part of the connecting member 110, when the connecting member is rotated in relation to the base 101, the monitor 102 faces in a downward direction, and therefore is not rotatably combined to the monitor 102. This is in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application, which recites "a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor."

While the Description of the Related Art does discuss in paragraph [0008] another monitor apparatus, which is not illustrated in the present application, which has the monitor rotatably connected to the connecting member, that connecting member is fixed at the base, which precludes adjustment of the height of the monitor with respect to the base. This would also be in direct contrast to claim 1 of the present application, which also recites "a first link provided between the monitor and the base; a second link provided between the monitor and the base, and adjacent to the first link;" and "a base bracket, combined to the base, the base bracket having first and second lower supporting parts to rotatably support lower parts of the first and second links, respectively." Thus, neither of the monitor apparatuses discussed in the description of the related art disclose at least the discussed features of claim 1 of the present application.

Therefore, the Description of the Related Art does not disclose at least the features of "a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor," and "a base bracket, combined to the base...to rotatably support lower parts of the first and second links." Accordingly, the Description of the Related Art does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claim 1. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since the Description of the Related Art does not disclose

the features recited in independent claim 1, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the Description of the Related Art, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims 2-15 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the Description of the Related Art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-15 also patentably distinguish over the Description of the Related Art.

Claim 16 of the present application recites "a connecting bracket rotatably combined to the monitor" and a base bracket combined to the base and comprising "a first lower supporting part to rotatably support a lower part of the first link," the "first link extending from the monitor to the base." As discussed in relation to claim 1 of the present application, the Description of the Related Art does not disclose at least these features of claim 16 of the present application. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 also patentably distinguishes over the Description of the Related Art.

Claims 17-18, 22-28, 30-31, and 33 depend from claim 16 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the Description of the Related Art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 17-18, 22-28, 30-31, and 33 also patentably distinguish over the Description of the Related Art.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103

On pages 4-5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 19-21, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Description of the Related Art of the specification, as identified by Figures 1-2B of the drawings, and pages 1-2 of the specification, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,822,857, issued to Jung et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Jung"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections of these claims.

As discussed in the preceding section of this Amendment, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the Description of the Related Art. Jung apparently discloses a connecting supporter having a through hole via which the monitor coupler is rotatably combined to the connecting supporter. Therefore, Jung does not cure the deficiencies of the Description of the Related Art in regard to claim 16. Further, claims 19-21, 32, and 34 depend from claim 16 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the Description of the Related Art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 19-21,

32, and 34 also patentably distinguish over the Description of the Related Art.

On page 5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Description of the Related Art of the specification, as identified by Figures 1-2B of the drawings, and pages 1-2 of the specification.

As discussed in the preceding section of this Amendment, claim 16 patentably distinguishes over the Description of the Related Art. Further, claim 29 depends from claim 16 and includes all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the Description of the Related Art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 29 also patentably distinguishes over the Description of the Related Art.

Summary

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 4, 6, 12, and 25 have been amended to correct grammatical informalities and/or typographical errors. No new matter has been presented. Thus, claims 1-34 remain pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/01/06

By: Thomas L. Jones
Thomas L. Jones
Registration No. 53,908

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501